

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 22, 27, 31, 35 and 36 are amended. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Riddle and Examiner Lee at the interview held May 5, 2009 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

The Office Action, on page 2, alleges that the references struck through on Form PTO-1449 as submitted with the November 30, 2006 Information Disclosure Statement were not considered because copies of the references were not received. As evidenced by the enclosed filing receipt for the November 30, 2006 Information Disclosure Statement, all of the references were received by the Patent Office. Copies of the references are filed concurrently with this Amendment for the Examiner's convenience.

Claims 12 and 22 were objected to for informalities. Claims 12 and 22 have been amended responsive to the objection.

It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because "said photosensitive object is longer than said predetermined length" is allegedly indefinite. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the personal interview, claim 31 has been amended to rearrange and therefore clarify claim 31. Specifically, claim 31 has been amended such that "predetermined length" more clearly refers to the "substantial wavelength" of claim 31.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because it is allegedly unclear what "in number" is meant to modify. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 35 has been amended to recite a number of said first exposure apparatus is larger than a number of said second exposure apparatus.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 11, 12, 24, 26, 31, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Sugita, JP-A-2000-021763. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites that each of a plurality of areas on said photosensitive object is exposed by said plurality of times of exposure, and after said plurality of areas are exposed by one of said at least one exposure and said another exposure, said plurality of areas are exposed by the other of said at least one exposure and said another exposure. Applicant respectfully asserts that Sugita does not expose each of a plurality of areas. Instead, Sugita exposes areas such that some of the areas overlap. See, for example, Sugita's claim 1.

Claims 11, 24, 26, 36 and 37 are patentable by reason of their dependency from one of independent claims 1, 12 and 31, as well as for the additional features they recite.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8, 13-21, 25, 27, 29, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sugita in view of Kudo, JP-A-10-340846. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection of claims 2-8, 13-21, 25, 32 and 33 is premised upon the rejection of claims 1, 12 and 31. As discussed above, Sugita fails to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 12 and 31. Further, Kudo fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sugita. Thus, claims 2-8, 13-21, 25 and 33 are patentable by reason of their dependency from independent claims 1, 12 and 31, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Claim 27 recites an exposure apparatus that performs a plurality of times of exposure on a same photosensitive object. The Office Action alleges that Sugita teaches the features of claim 27. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Sugita describes in paragraph [0127] "the use of the exposure method for performing multiple exposures of fine-line exposure and rough exposure using different exposure apparatuses of the present invention, and the use of these exposure apparatuses can realize various exposure patterns of 80 nm or less without greatly reducing throughput." During the personal interview, the Examiner explained that the rejection is premised upon the fact that claims calling for "a device" also read on multiple devices. However, this explanation does not account for the fact that claim 27 calls for a same photosensitive object. Applicant respectfully asserts that Sugita cannot be interpreted as reading on claim 27 because Sugita specifically calls for apparatuses.

Claim 29 is patentable by reason of its dependency from independent claim 27, as well as for the additional features it recites.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8, 19-21, 28 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sugita in view of Kudo and Fujishima et al., JP-A-2000-058436. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection of claims 6-8, 19-21, 28 and 34 is premised upon the rejection of independent claims 1, 12 and 31. As discussed above, Sugita fails to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 12 and 31. Further, Kudo and Fujishima fail to overcome the deficiencies of Sugita. Thus, claims 6-8, 19-21, 28 and 34 are patentable by reason of their dependency from one of independent claims 1, 12 and 31, as well as for the additional features they recite.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 22 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sugita in view of Kroyan et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0048288. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 recites a wavelength of an exposure light...in said at least one exposure is different from a wavelength of exposure light in said another exposure. Claims 22 and 36 call for similar features.

During the personal interview, the Examiner explained that, when interpreted broadly, Kroyan reads on claims 9, 22 and 36 because each different wavelength in Kroyan can be interpreted as an exposure. Based upon the amendments to independent claims 1, 12 and 31, Applicant respectfully asserts that such an interpretation is not reasonable because the amendments to independent claims 1, 12 and 31 clearly define exposures such that said at least one exposure and said another exposure are different than the Office Action's interpretation.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sugita's first embodiment and second embodiment. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

This rejection is premised upon Sugita teaching or suggesting all of the features of independent claims 1 and 12. As discussed above, Sugita fails to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1 and 12. Thus, claims 10 and 23 are patentable by reason of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 12, as well as for the additional features they recite.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sugita in view of Kroyan. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 27 recites an exposure apparatus that performs a plurality of times of exposure on a same photosensitive object. As discussed above, Sugita fails to teach or suggest these features. Kroyan fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sugita because Kroyan is cited as

allegedly teaching or suggesting an adjustment unit. Thus, Kroyan fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sugita.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sugita in view of Loopstra et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,969,441. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Sugita fails to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 31. Further, Loopstra fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sugita. Thus, claim 35 is patentable by reason of its dependency from independent claim 31, as well as for the additional features it recites.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-37 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Steven D. Jinks
Registration No. 62,760

MAC:SDJ/mkg

Attachments:

November 30, 2006 Filing Receipt
Missing References from November 30, 2006
Information Disclosure Statement

Date: May 13, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
